

REMARKS

Claim 5 was objected to. The drawings were objected to. Various claims were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 1 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

The specification has been amended. Claims 1, 5, 8 and 9 have been amended. Claim 4 and claims 11 to 14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 15 to 24 have been added. Support is found throughout the specification and in the incorporated-by-reference patents.

Claim objection

Claim 5 has been made dependent on claim 4, and applicant thanks the Examioner for noticing this typographical error. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Drawing objections

The feature of claim 6 is shown clearly in the Fig. 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,500, which are incorporated-by-reference in the present specification and which describes the control circuit 18 shown in Fig. 2 of the present application.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is thus respectfully requested.

Obviousness-type double patenting

Three terminal disclaimers signed by the attorney of record are filed herewith to remove the obvious-type double patenting rejections, as both cited patents are commonly owned by the present assignee, Oyster Optics, Inc. Withdrawal of the obviousness-type double-patenting rejections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fuse in view of Kimbrough. Claims 3 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fuse in view of Kimbrough and further in view of Siegel.

Fuse shows an optical transmitter with two phase modulating portions controlled by an FM portion and a receiver with an optical delay portion.

Kimbrough shows prior art ONU devices in Fig. 2A, and describes in Fig. 4B various circuit cards in a card cage with ONU 50. ONU 50 has no backplane (see col. 8, line 63). Service cards 90 are provided.

Claim 1 of the present invention recites “a receiver having an interferometer for reading received optical signals, the interferometer having a delay loop fiber; and a securing device for securing the delay loop fiber.”

Neither Fuse nor Kimbrough shows a delay loop fiber, and neither shows a securing device for the fiber.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, neither Fuse nor Kimbrough shows a faceplate having a fiber tap signal device for indicating a fiber tap, as now recited in claim 9, which has been placed in independent form.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights

485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor

New York, New York 10018

(212) 736-1940